Operational one-to-one mapping between coherence and entanglement measures

Huangjun Zhu,[1,*] Zhihao Ma,[2,*] Zhu Cao,[3] Shao-Ming Fei,[4,5] and Vlatko Vedral[6,7]

[1] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, Cologne 50937, Germany*[†]
[2] *Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, 200240, China*[‡]
[3] *Center for Quantum Information, Institute for Interdisciplinary Information Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*
[4] *School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China*
[5] *Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, 04103 Leipzig, Germany*
[6] *Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PU, UK*
[7] *Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543, Singapore*

(Dated: April 7, 2017)

Quantum entanglement and quantum coherence are two critical resources in quantum information processing. Here we establish a general operational one-to-one mapping between coherence and entanglement measures: Any entanglement measure of bipartite pure states is the minimum of a suitable coherence measure over product bases. Conversely, any coherence measure of pure states, with extension to mixed states by convex roof, is the maximum entanglement generated by incoherent operations on the system and an incoherent ancilla. Remarkably, the generalized CNOT gate is the universal optimal incoherent operation. In this way, we endow all these coherence measures with operational interpretations, including the celebrated coherence of formation and coherence cost. In addition, our work is instrumental in studying interconversion between coherence and entanglement.

arXiv:1704.01935v1 [quant-ph] 6 Apr 2017

Quantum entanglement is a crucial resource for many quantum information processing tasks, such as quantum teleportation, dense coding, and quantum key distribution; see Ref. [1] for a review. It is also a useful tool for studying various intriguing phenomena in many-body physics and high energy physics, such as quantum phase transition and black hole information paradox.

Quantum coherence underlies entanglement and is even more fundamental. It plays a key role in various research areas, such as interference [2–4], laser [2], quantum metrology [5–7], quantum computation [8–11], quantum thermodynamics [12–18], and photosynthesis [19, 20]. However, the significance of coherence as a resource, like entanglement, was not fully appreciated until the work of Aberg [3] and that of Baumgratz et al. [21], which studied coherence systematically from the perspective of resource theories [22–27]. Coherence has since found increasing applications and attracted increasing attention. Accordingly, great efforts have been devoted to quantifying coherence as a resource, and a number of useful measures have been proposed [3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 21, 26–40]; see Ref. [27] for an overview.

The resource theory of coherence and that of entanglement share a lot of common features, which plays an important role in studying coherence by virtue of rich literature on entanglement; conversely, progress on coherence provides further insight on entanglement [3, 10, 21, 26–31, 41–49]. In Refs. [41, 42] it is shown that any degree of coherence in some reference basis can be converted to entanglement via incoherent operations. In addition, this procedure can induce coherent measures, including relative entropy of coherence [3, 21] and geometric coherence [42], from entanglement measures. However, little is known about what measures can be induced in this way beyond a few examples, and the connection between coherence and entanglement is far from clear.

In this letter, we show that any entanglement measure of bipartite pure states is the minimum of a suitable coherence measure over product bases. Conversely, any coherence measure of pure states, with extension to mixed states by convex roof, is equal to the maximum entanglement generated by incoherent operations acting on the system and an incoherent ancilla. Remarkably, the generalized CNOT gate turns out to be the universal optimal incoherent operation for entanglement generation, as illustrated in Fig. 1. In this way we endow all such coherence measures with operational meanings. In particular, our study provides an operational interpretation of coherence of formation (identical to coherence cost [26]) in terms of entanglement generation. In addition, our work is instrumental in studying interconversion between coherence and entanglement.

A resource theory is characterized by two basic ingredients, namely, the set of free states and the set of free operations [22–24, 27]. In the resource theory of entanglement, free states are separable states, and free operations are local operations and classical communication (LOCC) [1]. In the case of coherence, free states are *incoherent states*, which correspond to density matrices that are diagonal in the reference basis, and free operations are *incoherent operations* (IO). Recall that an operation with Kraus representation $\{K_n\}$ satisfying $\sum_n K_n^\dagger K_n = I$ is incoherent if each Kraus operator is incoherent, that is, $K_n \rho K_n^\dagger / p_n \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{I}$, where $p_n = \mathrm{tr}(K_n \rho K_n^\dagger)$ and $\mathcal{I}$ denotes the set of incoherent states [3, 21, 26, 27]. The operation is strictly incoherent if both K_n and $K_n^\dagger$ are incoherent; the set of such operations is denoted by SIO. Although we are primarily concerned with IO, most of our results still apply if IO is replaced by SIO.

A central question in any resource theory is to quantify



FIG. 1. (color online) Operational one-to-one mapping between coherence and entanglement monotones. Any entanglement monotone E_f for $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$ between B and A is the minimum of C_f under local unitary transformations. Any coherent monotone C_f of the system B is the maximum of E_f generated by incoherent operations on the system B and an incoherent ancilla A. The generalized CNOT gate is the universal optimal incoherent operation.

the utility of resource states, states that are not free [22–24, 27]. Here are four typical requirements for a coherence measure C [21, 27] (the situation for entanglement is analogous). (C1) Nonnegativity $C(\rho) \geq 0$ (usually $C(\rho) = 0$ for incoherent states); (C2) monotonicity under any incoherent operation Λ, $C(\Lambda(\rho)) \leq C(\rho)$; (C3) monotonicity under any selective incoherent operation $\{K_n\}$, $\sum_n p_n C(\sigma_n) \leq C(\rho)$, where $\sigma_n = K_n \rho K_n^\dagger / p_n$ with $p_n = {\rm tr}(K_n \rho K_n^\dagger)$; (C4) convexity, $\sum_j q_j C(\rho_j) \geq C(\sum_j q_j \rho_j)$. A *coherence monotone* satisfies (C2-4), while a *coherence measure* satisfies all (C1-4).

Before discussing the connection between coherence and entanglement, it is instructive to review the general framework for constructing entanglement monotones introduced by Vidal [50] and its analog for coherence [28]. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a $d \times d$ bipartite Hilbert space. Denote by $\mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$ the set of real symmetric concave functions on the probability simplex. Given any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$, an entanglement monotone for $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ can be defined as

$$E_f(\psi) = f(\lambda(\psi)), \tag{1}$$

where $\lambda(\psi)$ is the *Schmidt vector* of ψ, that is, the vector of Schmidt coefficients (eigenvalues of each reduced density matrix), which form a probability vector. The monotone extends to mixed states by convex roof,

$$E_f(\rho) = \min_{\{p_j, \psi_j\}} \sum_j p_j E_f(\psi_j), \tag{2}$$

where the minimum is taken over all pure state decompositions $\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$. The extension to systems with different local dimensions is straightforward. The connection between entanglement monotones and symmetric concave functions is summarized in Theorem 1 below, a variant of the result in Ref. [50], but tailored to highlight the connection with coherence monotones; see Supplemental Material for background and a proof.

Theorem 1. For any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$, the function E_f defined by Eqs. (1) and (2) is an entanglement monotone. Conversely, the restriction to pure states of any entanglement monotone is identical to E_f for certain $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$.

Interestingly, coherence monotones for pure states are also in one-to-one correspondence with symmetric concave functions on the probability simplex [28]. Given any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$, a coherence monotone of d-dimensional pure states can be defined as follows,

$$C_f(\psi) = f(\mu(\psi)), \tag{3}$$

where $\mu(\psi) = (|\psi_0|^2, |\psi_1|^2, \ldots, |\psi_{d-1}|^2)^{\rm T}$ is the *coherence vector*, and ψ_j are the components of ψ in the reference basis. For mixed states,

$$C_f(\rho) = \min_{\{p_j, \psi_j\}} \sum_j p_j C_f(\psi_j). \tag{4}$$

This construction is summarized in Theorem 2 below, which is applicable either IO or SIO is taken as the set of free operations. The result concerning IO was first presented in Ref. [28] (with minor variation); the original proof has a gap, but can be filled. A simple proof was given in Supplemental Material, which is tied to the majorization criterion on coherent transformations [43].

Theorem 2. For any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$, the function C_f defined by Eqs. (3) and (4) is a coherence monotone. Conversely, the restriction to pure states of any coherence monotone is identical to C_f for certain $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$.

Theorems 1 and 2 provide many useful entanglement and coherence measures. When $f(p) = -\sum_j p_j \log p_j$ denotes the Shannon entropy, E_f is the celebrated entanglement of formation $E_{\rm F}$ (coinciding with the relative entropy of entanglement $E_{\rm r}$ for pure states) [1], and C_f is the coherence of formation $C_{\rm F}$ [3] (equal to the coherence cost $C_{\rm C}$ [26]). When $f(p) = 1 - \max_j p_j$, E_f is the geometric entanglement $E_{\rm G}$ [1], and C_f is the geometric coherence $C_{\rm G}$ [42]. When $f(p)$ denotes the number of nonzero components of p, E_f reduces to the Schmidt rank $E_{\rm rk}$, and C_f to the coherence rank $C_{\rm rk}$ [32, 49].

The similarity between entanglement and coherence monotones shown in Theorems 1, 2 calls for a simple explanation. Here we shall reveal the operational underpinning of this resemblance. Our study benefits from the theory of majorization [51, 52], which has found extensive applications in quantum information science [28, 43, 44, 53–57]. Given two d-dimensional real vectors $x = (x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1})^{\rm T}$ and $y = (y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{d-1})^{\rm T}$, vector x is majorized by y, written as $x \prec y$ or $y \succ x$, if

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} x_j^{\downarrow} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k} y_j^{\downarrow} \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1,$$

with equality for $k = d-1$. Here $x^{\downarrow}$ denotes the vector obtained by arranging the components of x in decreasing

order. In this work, we also need to consider majorization relations between vectors of different dimensions. In such cases, it will be understood implicitly that the vector with few components is padded with a number of "0" to match the other vector. The notation $x \simeq y$ means that $x \prec y$ and $y \prec x$, so that x and y have the same nonzero components up to permutations.

Now we can clarify the relation between coherence and entanglement for a bipartite system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\rm B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\rm A}$ of dimension $d_{\rm B} \otimes d_{\rm A}$. The reference basis is the tensor product of respective reference bases.

Lemma 1. $\mu(\psi) \prec \lambda(\psi)$ and $C_{\rm rk}(\psi) \geq E_{\rm rk}(\psi)$ for any $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\rm B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\rm A}$. If $\mu(\psi) \simeq \lambda(\psi)$, then $C_{\rm rk}(\psi) = E_{\rm rk}(\psi)$, and vice versa; they hold if and only if $|\psi\rangle$ has the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j(\psi)} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\theta_j} |\pi_1(j)\pi_2(j)\rangle, \tag{5}$$

where θ_j are arbitrary phases, and π_1, π_2 are permutations of bases states for $\mathcal{H}_{\rm B}, \mathcal{H}_{\rm A}$, respectively.

Lemma 1 implies that $\mu\left((\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)(\psi)\right) \prec \lambda(\psi)$ for arbitrary local unitaries U_1, U_2, where $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ denote the channels corresponding to U_1, U_2. In addition,

$$\max_{U_1,U_2} \mu^{\downarrow}\left((\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)(\psi)\right) \simeq \lambda^{\downarrow}(\psi). \tag{6}$$

Here the maximization is taken with respect to the majorization order, which is well defined, as guaranteed by Lemma 1 and Schmidt decomposition. In this way, Lemma 1 offers an appealing interpretation of Schmidt vectors in terms of coherence vectors.

Proof. Expand $|\psi\rangle$ in the reference basis $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{jk} c_{jk}|jk\rangle$, then $\mu(\psi) = (|c_{jk}|^2)_{jk}$. Let $\rho_{\rm B}$ be the reduced density matrix for subsystem B, then the diagonal of $\rho_{\rm B}$ reads $\mathrm{diag}(\rho_{\rm B}) = (\sum_k |c_{jk}|^2)_j$. It follows that $\mu(\psi) \prec \mathrm{diag}(\rho_{\rm B}) \prec \mathrm{eig}(\rho_{\rm B}) \simeq \lambda(\psi)$, where $\mathrm{eig}(\rho_{\rm B})$ denotes the vector of eigenvalues of $\rho_{\rm B}$, and we have applied the majorization relation $\mathrm{diag}(\rho_{\rm B}) \prec \mathrm{eig}(\rho_{\rm B})$ [52]. The inequality $C_{\rm rk}(\psi) \geq E_{\rm rk}(\psi)$ is an immediate consequence of the relation $\mu(\psi) \prec \lambda(\psi)$.

Let $r = E_{\rm rk}(\psi)$ be the Schmidt rank of $|\psi\rangle$. If $\mu(\psi) \simeq \lambda(\psi)$, then $C_{\rm rk}(\psi) = E_{\rm rk}(\psi) = r$. If $C_{\rm rk}(\psi) = E_{\rm rk}(\psi) = r$, then $|\{j|c_{jk} \neq 0 \ \exists k\}| \geq r$ given that $\rho_{\rm B}$ has rank r. By the same token $|\{k|c_{jk} \neq 0 \ \exists j\}| \geq r$. So the coefficient matrix c_{jk} has exactly r nonzero components, with at most one on each row and each column. Therefore, $|\psi\rangle$ has the form $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} a_j |\pi_1(j)\pi_2(j)\rangle$ with $\sum_j |a_j|^2 = 1$, where π_1, π_2 are two permutations of basis states. Then $|a_j|^2$ coincide with the Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$, which implies Eq. (5) after redefining π_1, π_2 if necessary. Conversely, the relation $\mu(\psi) \simeq \lambda(\psi)$ holds automatically whenever $|\psi\rangle$ has the form Eq. (5). □

Theorem 3. For any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$,

$$E_f(\rho) \leq \min_{U_1,U_2} C_f\left(U_1 \otimes U_2 \rho (U_1 \otimes U_2)^\dagger\right) \quad \forall \rho; \tag{7}$$

the inequality is saturated if ρ is pure.

The bound in Eq. (7) is also saturated by maximally correlated states according to Theorem 4 below.

Proof. If $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is pure, then $\mu(\psi) \prec \lambda(\psi)$ by Lemma 1, so $E_f(\rho) = f(\lambda(\psi)) \leq f(\mu(\psi)) = C_f(\rho)$ since f is concave and thus Schur concave. This result confirms Eq. (7) for pure states since entanglement is invariant under local unitary transformations. The inequality is saturated thanks to the Schmidt decomposition.

Now suppose ρ is a mixed state with an optimal decomposition $\rho = \sum_j p_j \rho_j$ with respect to C_f. Then

$$C_f(\rho) = \sum_j p_j C_f(\rho_j) \geq \sum_j p_j E_f(\rho_j) \geq E_f(\rho),$$

from which Eq. (7) follows. □

Theorem 3 shows that any entanglement monotone of bipartite pure states is the minimum of a coherence monotone. Conversely, any coherent state on $\mathcal{H}_{\rm B}$ can generate entanglement under incoherent operations on the system and an incoherent ancilla. The maximum entanglement E generated defines a coherence monotone C_E by Ref. [42],

$$C_E(\rho) := \lim_{d_{\rm A}\to\infty} \left\{ \sup_{\Lambda_{\rm i}} E\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) \right\}. \tag{8}$$

Here $d_{\rm A}$ is the dimension of the ancilla, and the supremum runs over all incoherent operations. Interestingly, $C_E = C_{\rm r}, C_{\rm G}$ when $E = E_{\rm r}, E_{\rm G}$. However, little is known about other coherence monotones so constructed.

By Eq. (8), we can introduce another coherence monotone for any symmetric concave function $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$,

$$\tilde{C}_f(\rho) := C_{E_f} := \lim_{d_{\rm A}\to\infty} \left\{ \sup_{\Lambda_{\rm i}} E_f\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) \right\}.$$

Surprisingly, $\tilde{C}_f(\rho)$ coincides with C_f for any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$. A key to establishing this result is the generalized CNOT gate $\mathcal{U}_{\rm CNOT}$ corresponding to the unitary $U_{\rm CNOT}$,

$$U_{\rm CNOT}|jk\rangle = \begin{cases} |j(j+k)\rangle & k < d_{\rm B}, \\ |jk\rangle & k \geq d_{\rm B}, \end{cases}$$

where the addition is modulo $d_{\rm B}$. This operation (defined when $d_{\rm A} \geq d_{\rm B}$) turns any state $\rho = \sum_{jk} \rho_{jk}|j\rangle\langle k|$ into a *maximally correlated state* [26, 42, 58],

$$\rho_{\rm MC} := \mathcal{U}_{\rm CNOT}\left[\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right] = \sum_{jk} \rho_{jk}|jj\rangle\langle kk|.$$

Theorem 4. $E_f(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_f(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_f(\rho) = \tilde{C}_f(\rho)$ for any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$.

Proof. The equality $C_f(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_f(\rho)$ is clear from the definition of $\rho_{\rm MC}$. The equality $E_f(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_f(\rho_{\rm MC})$ follows from the fact that any $|\Psi\rangle$ in the support of $\rho_{\rm MC}$ has the form $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_j c_j|jj\rangle$ with $\sum_j |c_j|^2 = 1$, so that $E_f(\Psi) = C_f(\Psi)$. Therefore, $C_f(\rho) = E_f(\rho_{\rm MC}) \leq \tilde{C}_f(\rho)$. The converse $\tilde{C}_f(\rho) \leq C_f(\rho)$ holds because

$$\begin{aligned} E_f\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) &\leq C_f\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) \\ &\leq C_f\left(\rho\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|\right) = C_f(\rho), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 3, and the second one from the monotonicity of C_f. □

Theorem 4 endows every coherence monotone of pure states with an operational meaning as the maximal entanglement that can be generated between the system and an incoherent ancilla under incoherent operations. This connection extends to all coherence monotones of mixed states that are based on convex roof. Remarkably, the generalized CNOT gate is optimal for entanglement generation with respect to all these monotones, which further implies that SIO and IO are equally powerful for entanglement generation. Theorems 3 and 4 together establish a one-to-one mapping between coherence monotones and entanglement monotones, as illustrated in Fig. 1.

Theorem 4 in particular applies to measures based on Rényi α-entropies $f(p) = (\log\sum_j p_j^\alpha)/(1-\alpha)$ with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ [28, 30, 50], which play a key role in catalytic entanglement and coherence transformations [56, 57]. The limit $\alpha \to 1$ recovers the relation $E_{\rm C}(\rho_{\rm MC}) = E_{\rm F}(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_{\rm F}(\rho) = C_{\rm C}(\rho)$ [26]. Theorem 4 also implies $E_{\rm G}(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_{\rm G}(\rho)$ [42]. Moreover, the generalized CNOT gate is the universal optimal incoherence operation. This conclusion was known for the geometric measure [42], but our proof is simpler even in this case.

The power of Theorem 4 is not limited to entanglement monotones based on convex roof. It provides a nontrivial upper bound for entanglement generation for every entanglement monotone E. Note that, when restricted to pure states, E is determined by a symmetric concave function $f_E \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$, which in turn defines an entanglement monotone $\hat{E} := E_{f_E}$, usually referred to as the convex roof of E. For example, $E_{\rm F}$ is the convex roof of $E_{\rm r}$. By construction $\hat{E}(\sigma) \geq E(\sigma)$ for any bipartite state σ (with equality for pure states), so $C_E(\rho) \leq C_{\hat{E}}(\rho) = C_{f_E}(\rho)$. The same idea can also extend the scope of Theorem 3.

As another extension, Theorems 3, 4 still apply if E_f, C_f are replaced by $h(E_f), h(C_f)$ with h a real function that is monotonically increasing. In addition, the constructions in Eqs. (1-4) can be extended to functions f that are Schur concave; the resulting E_f, C_f are not necessarily full monotones, but are useful in some applications [55–57]. Theorem 3 holds as before, so do the equalities $E_f(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_f(\rho_{\rm MC}) = C_f(\rho)$ in Theorem 4.

Lemma 1 and Theorems 3, 4 not only offer valuable insight on the connection between coherence and entanglement monotones, but also provide powerful tools for studying interconversion between the two resources.

Theorem 5. Suppose $|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| = \Lambda_{\rm i}\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|\right]$ with an incoherent operation $\Lambda_{\rm i}$. Then $\lambda(\Phi) \succ \mu(\psi)$. If $|\Phi\rangle$ has Schmidt form in the reference basis, $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|jj\rangle$ with $\lambda_j \geq 0$ and $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$. Then $|\psi\rangle$ can transform to $|\Phi\rangle$ under IO or SIO iff $\lambda(\Phi) \succ \mu(\psi)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1, $\lambda(\Phi) \succ \mu(\Phi) \succ \mu(\psi)$, where the second inequality follows from the coherence analog of the majorization criterion [43, 53]; cf. Supplemental Material.

When $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|jj\rangle$, let $|\phi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|j\rangle$. If $\lambda(\Phi) \succ \mu(\psi)$, then $\mu(\phi) \succ \mu(\psi)$, so $|\psi\rangle$ can transform to $|\phi\rangle$ under SIO [43] (cf. Supplemental Material), which implies the theorem since $|\Phi\rangle = U_{\rm CNOT}(|\phi\rangle\otimes|0\rangle)$. □

Theorem 6. Let $P(\psi\to\Phi)$ be the maximal probability that $|\Phi\rangle$ can be generated from $|\psi\rangle$ by IO (or SIO) on the system and an incoherent ancilla. Then

$$P(\psi\to\Phi) \leq \min_{m\geq 0} \frac{\sum_{j\geq m}\mu_j^\downarrow(\psi)}{\sum_{j\geq m}\lambda_j^\downarrow(\Phi)}, \tag{9}$$

with equality if $|\Phi\rangle$ has the Schmidt form $\sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|jj\rangle$.

Theorem 6 implies that the Schmidt rank of $|\Phi\rangle$ can not exceed the coherence rank of $|\psi\rangle$ even probabilistically.

Proof. Define $f_m(p) = \sum_{j\geq m} p_j^\downarrow$ for positive integers m. Then E_{f_m} and C_{f_m} are entanglement and coherence measures according to Theorems 1 and 2; cf. Ref. [28, 50]. Therefore,

$$P(\psi\to\Phi) \leq \frac{C_{f_m}(\psi)}{C_{f_m}(\Phi)} \leq \frac{C_{f_m}(\psi)}{E_{f_m}(\Phi)} = \frac{\sum_{j\geq m}\mu_j^\downarrow(\psi)}{\sum_{j\geq m}\lambda_j^\downarrow(\Phi)},$$

which confirms Eq. (9) since $\sum_{j\geq 0}\mu_j^\downarrow(\psi) = \sum_{j\geq 0}\lambda_j^\downarrow(\Phi)$.

When $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|jj\rangle$, let $\phi = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|j\rangle$. Then $|\Phi\rangle = U_{\rm CNOT}(|\phi\rangle\otimes|0\rangle)$. Therefore

$$P(\psi\to\Phi) \geq P(\psi\to\phi) = \min_{m\geq 0}\frac{\sum_{j\geq m}\mu_j^\downarrow(\psi)}{\sum_{j\geq m}\mu_j^\downarrow(\phi)}.$$

Here $P(\psi\to\phi)$ is the maximal probability of transforming $|\psi\rangle$ to $|\phi\rangle$ under IO (or SIO), which was determined in Ref. [28]; cf. Supplemental Material. So the inequality in Eq. (9) is saturated since $\mu(\phi) \simeq \lambda(\Phi)$. □

By virtue of the theory of majorization, we established a general operational one-to-one mapping between coherence and entanglement measures. In particular we showed that any entanglement measure of bipartite pure

states is the minimum of a suitable coherence measure over product bases; any coherence measure of pure states, with extension to mixed states by convex roof, is equal to the maximum entanglement generated by (strictly) incoherent operations between the system and an incoherent ancilla. In this way we endow all these coherence measures with operational meanings. Furthermore, we gave a nontrivial upper bound for entanglement generation with respect to every entanglement measure even if it is not based on the convex roof. Our work not only offers valuable insight on the connection between coherence and entanglement, but also provides powerful tools for studying interconversion between the two resources. In addition, it is instrumental in clarifying the similarity and distinction between IO and SIO as free operations in the resource theory of coherence.

ZM thanks Prof. Jingyun Fan for discussion. HZ acknowledges financial support from the Excellence Initiative of the German Federal and State Governments (ZUK 81) and the DFG. ZM acknowledges support from The National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC), Grant Nos. 11275131, 11571313. SMF acknowledges support from NSFC, Grant No. 11675113. VV thanks the Oxford Martin School at the University of Oxford, the Leverhulme Trust (UK), the John Templeton Foundation, the EU Collaborative Project ThermiQ (Grant Agree- 5 ment 618074), the COST Action MP1209, the EPSRC (UK) and the Ministry of Manpower (Singapore). This research is also supported by the National Research Foundation, Prime Ministers Office, Singapore, under its Competitive Research Programme (CRP Award No. NRF- CRP14-2014-02) and administered by Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore.

* These authors contributed equally to this work.
† hzhu1@uni-koeln.de
‡ ma9452316@gmail.com

[1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[2] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).
[3] J. Aberg, Quantifying Superposition, arXiv:quant-ph/0612146.
[4] T. Biswas, M. García Díaz, A. Winter, Interferometric visibility and coherence, arXiv:1701.05051
[5] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Quantum-Enhanced Measurements: Beating the Standard Quantum Limit, Science **306**, 1330 (2004).
[6] B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, General framework for estimating the ultimate precision limit in noisy quantum-enhanced metrology, Nature Physics **7**, 406-411 (2011).
[7] I. Marvian, and R. W. Spekkens, How to quantify coherence: Distinguishing speakable and unspeakable notions, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 052324 (2016).
[8] P. W. Shor, Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory, Phys. Rev. A **52**, R2493 (1995).
[9] M. Hillery, Coherence as a resource in decision problems: The Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm and a variation, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012111 (2016).
[10] J. J. Ma, B. Yadin, D. Girolami, V. Vedral, and M. Gu, Converting Coherence to Quantum Correlations, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 160407 (2016).
[11] J. M. Matera, D. Egloff, N. Killoran, M. B. Plenio, Coherent control of quantum systems as a resource theory, Quantum Science and Technology, 1, 01LT01 (2016).
[12] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, Fundamental limitations for quantum and nanoscale thermodynamics, Nature Communications, **4**, 2059 (2013).
[13] J. Aberg, Catalytic Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 150402 (2014).
[14] M. Lostaglio, K. Korzekwa, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Quantum Coherence, Time-Translation Symmetry, and Thermodynamics, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 021001 (2015).
[15] P. Ćwikliński, M. Studziński, M. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Limitations on the Evolution of Quantum Coherences: Towards Fully Quantum Second Laws of Thermodynamics, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 210403 (2015).
[16] M. T. Mitchison, M. P. Woods, J. Prior, M. Huber, Coherence-assisted single-shot cooling by quantum absorption refrigerators, New J. Phys. **17**, 115013 (2015).
[17] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. del Rio, P. Skrzypczyk, The role of quantum information in thermodynamics–a topical review, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **49**, 143001 (2016).
[18] M. Perarnau-Llobet, E. Bäumer, K. V. Hovhannisyan, M. Huber, A. Acín, No-Go Theorem for the Characterization of Work Fluctuations in Coherent Quantum Systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 070601 (2017).
[19] G. S. Engel, T. R. Calhoun, E. L. Read, T. K. Ahn, T. Mančal, Y. C. Cheng, R. E. Blakenship, and G. R. Fleming, Evidence for wavelike energy transfer through quantum coherence in photosynthetic systems, Nature **446**, 782 (2007).
[20] Y. C. Cheng and G. R. Fleming, Dynamics of light harvesting in photosynthesis, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **60**, 241 (2009).
[21] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Quantifying Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
[22] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, (Quantumness in the context of) resource theories, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345019 (2013).
[23] B. Coecke, T. Fritz, R. W. Spekkens, A mathematical theory of resources, Information and Computation, **250**, 59-86 (2016).
[24] F. G. S. L. Brandão, G. Gour, Reversible Framework for Quantum Resource Theories, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 070503 (2015).
[25] Z.-W. Liu, X. Hu, and S. Lloyd, Resource Destroying Maps, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 060502 (2017).
[26] A. Winter, D. Yang, Operational Resource Theory of Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 120404 (2016).
[27] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, M. B. Plenio, Quantum Coherence as a Resource, arXiv:1609.02439 [quant-ph].
[28] S. Du, Z. Bai, and X. Qi, Coherence Measures and Optimal Conversion for Coherent States, Quantum Info. Comput. **15**, 1307 (2015).

[29] E. Chitambar, G. Gour, Critical Examination of Incoherent Operations and a Physically Consistent Resource Theory of Quantum Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 030401 (2016).

[30] E. Chitambar, G. Gour, Comparison of incoherent operations and measures of coherence, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 052336 (2016).

[31] E. Chitambar and M. H. Hsieh, Relating the Resource Theories of Entanglement and Quantum Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 020402 (2016).

[32] J. I. de Vicente, A. Streltsov, Genuine quantum coherence, J. Phys. A **50**, 045301 (2017).

[33] C. Napoli, T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, M. Piani, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, Robustness of Coherence: An Operational and Observable Measure of Quantum Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 150502 (2016).

[34] M. Piani, M. Cianciaruso, T. R. Bromley, C. Napoli, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, Robustness of asymmetry and coherence of quantum states, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042107 (2016).

[35] S. Cheng and M. J. W. Hall, Complementarity relations for quantum coherence, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 042101 (2015).

[36] U. Singh, M. N. Bera, H. S. Dhar, A. K. Pati, Maximally coherent mixed states: Complementarity between maximal coherence and mixedness, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052115 (2015).

[37] S. Rana, P. Parashar, and M. Lewenstein, Trace-distance measure of coherence, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012110 (2016).

[38] T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, and G. Adesso, Frozen Quantum Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 210401 (2015).

[39] B. Yadin and V. Vedral, General framework for quantum macroscopicity in terms of coherence, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 022122 (2016).

[40] X.-D. Yu, D.-J. Zhang, G. F. Xu, and D. M. Tong, Alternative framework for quantifying coherence, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 060302(R) (2016).

[41] J. K. Asbóth, J. Calsamiglia, and H. Ritsch, Computable Measure of Nonclassicality for Light, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 173602 (2005).

[42] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Measuring Quantum Coherence with Entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015).

[43] S. Du, Z. Bai, and Y. Guo, Conditions for coherence transformations under incoherent operations, Phys. Rev. A. **91**, 052120 (2015); Erratum, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 029901(E) (2017).

[44] X. Qi, Z. Bai, and S. Du, Coherence convertibility for mixed states, arXiv:1505.07387 [quant-ph].

[45] Z. J. Xi, Y. M. Li, and H. Fan, Quantum coherence and correlations in quantum system, Sci. Rep. **5**, 10922 (2015).

[46] Y. Yao, X. Xiao, L. Ge, and C. P. Sun, Quantum coherence in multipartite systems, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022112 (2015).

[47] E. Chitambar, A. Streltsov, S. Rana, M. N. Bera, G. Adesso, and M. Lewenstein, Assisted Distillation of Quantum Coherence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 070402 (2016).

[48] A. Streltsov, E. Chitambar, S. Rana, M. N. Bera, A. Winter, and M. Lewenstein, Entanglement and Coherence in Quantum State Merging, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 240405 (2016).

[49] N. Killoran, F. E. S. Steinhoff, and M. B. Plenio, Converting Nonclassicality into Entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 080402 (2016).

[50] G. Vidal, Entanglement monotones, J. Modern Opt. **47**, 355 (2000).

[51] A. W. Marshall and I. Olkin and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and its Applications*, Springer Series in Statistics, second ed. (Springer 2011).

[52] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis* (Springer, New York, 1997).

[53] M. A Nielsen, Conditions for a Class of Entanglement Transformations, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436 (1999).

[54] G. Vidal, Entanglement of Pure States for a Single Copy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1046 (1999).

[55] K. Życzkowski, I. Bengtsson, Relativity of Pure States Entanglement, Ann. Phys. **295**, 115-135 (2002).

[56] S. Turgut, Catalytic transformations for bipartite pure states, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 12185-12212 (2007).

[57] K. Bu, U. Singh, and J. Wu, Catalytic coherence transformations, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042326 (2016).

[58] E. M. Rains, Bound on distillable entanglement, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 179 (1999).

Operational one-to-one mapping between coherence and entanglement measures: Supplemental Material

In this supplemental material we discuss in more detail the connection between entanglement monotones, coherence monotones, and symmetric concave functions on the probability simplex. We then prove Theorem 1 in the main text, which is a variant of a result first established by Vidal [50]. We also present a self-contained proof of Theorem 2, which was first presented by Du, Bai, and Qi [28]. The proof of Theorem 2 is closely tied to the majorization criterion on coherent transformations under incoherent operations [43], which is the analog of Nielsen's majorization criterion on entanglement transformations under local operations and classical communication (LOCC) [53]. For completeness, we also provide a simple proof of this result.

ENTANGLEMENT MONOTONES

Denote by $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ the space of density matrices on $\mathbb{C}^d$ and $\mathrm{U}(d)$ the group of unitary operators on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Let $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{u}}$ be the set of unitarily invariant functions on the space of density matrices. We assume that each function $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{u}}$ is defined on $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ for each positive integer d. For given d, the function satisfies

$$f(U\rho U^\dagger) = f(\rho) \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{C}^d),\ U \in \mathrm{U}(d). \tag{S1}$$

So $f(\rho)$ is a function of the eigenvalues of ρ. We also assume implicitly that the number of "0" in the spectrum of ρ does not affect the value of $f(\rho)$. Let $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{uc}} \subset \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{u}}$ be the set of unitarily invariant real concave functions on the space of density matrices. For given d, each function $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{uc}}$ satisfies Eq. (S1) and in addition

$$f(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2) \geq pf(\rho_1) + (1-p)f(\rho_2)$$
$$\forall \rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{C}^d),\ 0 \leq p \leq 1.$$

Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ be a bipartite Hilbert space shared by B and A. For simplicity here we assume that the Hilbert spaces for the two subsystems have the same dimension d, but this is not essential. Any function $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{uc}}$ can be used to construct an entanglement monotone E_f on $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ as follows [50]. For a pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$E_f(\psi) = f\left(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\right). \tag{S2}$$

The monotone is then extended to mixed states $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ by convex roof,

$$E_f(\rho) = \min_{\{p_j, \rho_j\}} \sum_j p_j E_f(\rho_j), \tag{S3}$$

where the minimization runs over all pure state ensembles of ρ for which $\rho = \sum_j p_j \rho_j$.

The following theorem is reproduced from Ref. [50], where the reader can find a detailed proof.

Theorem S1. For any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{uc}}$, the function E_f defined by Eqs. (S2) and (S3) is an entanglement monotone. Conversely, the restriction to pure states of any entanglement monotone is identical to E_f for certain $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{uc}}$.

Next we clarify the relation between Theorem S1 and Theorem 1 in the main text. Let Δ_d be the probability simplex of probability vectors with d components. A function on Δ_d is symmetric if it is invariant under permutations of the components of probability vectors. Let $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ be the set of symmetric functions on the probability simplex. Here we assume implicitly that each $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ is defined on Δ_d for each positive integer d. In addition, the value of $f(x)$ does not depend on the number of "0" in the components of x; in other words, $f(x) = f(y)$ whenever $x \simeq y$ (which means $x \prec y$ and $y \prec x$), even if x and y have different number of components.

Any symmetric function f on the probability simplex can be lifted to a unitarily invariant function on the space of density matrices,

$$\check{f}(\rho) = f(\mathrm{eig}(\rho)) \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{C}^d). \tag{S4}$$

Conversely, any unitarily invariant function f on the space of density matrices defines a symmetric function on the probability simplex when restricted to diagonal density matrices,

$$\hat{f}(p) = f(\mathrm{diag}(p)) \quad \forall p \in \Delta_d. \tag{S5}$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\hat{\check{f}} = f$ for any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ and that $\check{\hat{f}} = f$ for any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{u}}$. So the lifting map $f \mapsto \check{f}$ and the restriction map $f \mapsto \hat{f}$ establish a one-to-one correspondence between symmetric functions in $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ and unitarily invariant functions in $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{u}}$.

Recall that a real function f on the probability simplex is Schur convex if it preserves the majorization order, that is, $f(x) \leq f(y)$ whenever $x \prec y$. By contrast, f is Schur concave if it reverses the majorization order, that is, $f(x) \geq f(y)$ whenever $x \prec y$ [51, 52]. Note that Schur convex functions and Schur concave functions are necessarily symmetric. In addition, symmetric convex (concave) functions are automatically Schur convex (concave), but not vice versa in general. With this background, it is not difficult to show that the maps defined by Eqs. (S4) and (S5) preserve (Schur) convexity and (Schur) concavity for real functions. Here we prove one of these properties that is most relevant to the current study; the other three properties follow from a similar reasoning. Recall that $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{sc}}$ is the set of real symmetric concave functions on the probability simplex.

Lemma S1. The two maps $f \mapsto \check{f}$ and $f \mapsto \hat{f}$ set a bijection between $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{sc}}$ and $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{uc}}$.

Proof. To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that the two maps $f \mapsto \check{f}$ and $f \mapsto \hat{f}$ preserve concavity. Given $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$, let $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ be two arbitrary density matrices and $0 \le p \le 1$. It is well-known that [52]

$$\mathrm{eig}(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2) \prec p\,\mathrm{eig}^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) + (1-p)\,\mathrm{eig}^{\downarrow}(\rho_2). \quad \text{(S6)}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\check{f}\big(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2\big) = f\big(\mathrm{eig}(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2)\big) \\
&\ge f\big(p\,\mathrm{eig}^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) + (1-p)\,\mathrm{eig}^{\downarrow}(\rho_2)\big) \\
&\ge pf\big(\mathrm{eig}^{\downarrow}(\rho_1)\big) + (1-p)f\big(\mathrm{eig}^{\downarrow}(\rho_2)\big) \\
&= pf\big(\mathrm{eig}(\rho_1)\big) + (1-p)f\big(\mathrm{eig}(\rho_2)\big) \\
&= p\check{f}(\rho_1) + (1-p)\check{f}(\rho_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Eq. (S6) and Schur concavity of f, and the second inequality from the concavity of f. Therefore $\check{f}$ is concave whenever f is concave.

On the other hand, if $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm uc}$, then f is concave in particular on diagonal density matrices, which implies that $\hat{f}$ is concave. □

Proof of Theorem 1. The theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem S1 and Lemma S1. □

COHERENCE MONOTONES AND COHERENCE TRANSFORMATIONS

In this section we present a self-contained proof of Theorem 2, which connects coherence monotones and symmetric concave functions on the probability simplex. A variant of this result was first presented by Du, Bai, and Qi [28] (Theorem 1 there). The original proof has a gap in one direction (in particular the reasoning leading to Eq. (12) there was not fully justified). Nevertheless, all essential ideas are already manifested in the proof. It should be emphasized that the set of coherence monotones is the same irrespective whether IO or SIO is taken as the set of free operations. Our study also leads to a simpler proof of the majorization criterion on coherent transformations under incoherent operations [43]. As we shall see, the two proofs share a key ingredient, which reflects the strong connection between coherence measures and coherence transformations.

Recall that any quantum operation Λ (completely positive trace-preserving map) has a Kraus representation, that is, $\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_n K_n \rho K_n^\dagger$, where the Kraus operators K_n satisfy $\sum_n K_n^\dagger K_n = I$. The operator K_n is incoherent if $K_n \rho K_n^\dagger / p_n \in \mathcal{I}$ whenever $\rho \in \mathcal{I}$ and $p_n = \mathrm{tr}(K_n \rho K_n^\dagger) > 0$. It is strictly incoherent if in addition $K_n^\dagger$ is also incoherent. Simple calculation shows that K_n is incoherent iff its representation with respect to the reference basis has at most one nonzero entry in each column, and strictly incoherent if the same is also true for each row. The operation Λ with Kraus representation $\{K_n\}$ is (strictly) incoherent if each Kraus operator K_n is (strictly) incoherent.

Coherence monotones

Recall that $\mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$ is the set of real symmetric concave functions on the probability simplex, and that each function $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\rm sc}$ can be used to define a coherence monotone C_f [28]. When $|\psi\rangle$ is a pure state,

$$C_f(\psi) = f(\mu(\psi));$$

in general,

$$C_f(\rho) = \min_{\{p_j, \rho_j\}} \sum_j p_j C_f(\rho_j),$$

where the minimization runs over all pure state ensembles of ρ for which $\rho = \sum_j p_j \rho_j$.

Proof of Theorem 2. By the nature of the convex-roof construction, C_f is automatically convex. In addition, to prove monotonicity under selective operations, it suffices to consider the scenario with a pure initial state ψ. Let $\Lambda = \{K_n\}$ be an arbitrary incoherent operation and $|\varphi_n\rangle = K_n|\psi\rangle/\sqrt{p_n}$ with $p_n = \mathrm{tr}(K_n|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|K_n^\dagger)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_n p_n C_f(\varphi_n) = \sum_n p_n f(\mu^{\downarrow}(\varphi_n)) &\le f\left(\sum_n p_n \mu^{\downarrow}(\varphi_n)\right) \\
&\le f(\mu(\psi)) = C_f(\psi),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the concavity of f, and the second inequality follows from Lemma S2 below and Schur concavity of f (note that a symmetric concave function is automatically Schur concave). Therefore, C_f is indeed a coherence monotone.

Now comes to the converse, which is based on Ref. [28]. Let C be an arbitrary coherence monotone, then $C(\psi)$ is necessarily a symmetric function of $\mu(\psi)$ given that monomial unitaries (including permutations) are incoherent. Define f on the probability simplex as follows, $f(x) = C(\psi(x))$ with $|\psi(x)\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{x_j}|j\rangle$. Then f is clearly symmetric. To prove concavity, let x, y be two probability vectors, and $z = px + (1-p)y$ with $0 \le p \le 1$. Let $|\psi(y)\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{y_j}|j\rangle$ and $|\psi(z)\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{z_j}|j\rangle$. Construct the quantum operation with the following two Kraus operators

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &= \sqrt{p}\,\mathrm{diag}\left(\sqrt{\frac{x_0}{z_0}}, \sqrt{\frac{x_1}{z_1}}, \ldots, \sqrt{\frac{x_{d-1}}{z_{d-1}}}\right), \\
K_2 &= \sqrt{1-p}\,\mathrm{diag}\left(\sqrt{\frac{y_0}{z_0}}, \sqrt{\frac{y_1}{z_1}}, \ldots, \sqrt{\frac{y_{d-1}}{z_{d-1}}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here x_j/z_j and y_j/z_j for $0 \le j \le d-1$ can be set to 1 whenever $z_j = 0$, in which case either $p(1-p) = 0$ or

$x_j = y_j = 0$. Note that K_1, K_2 are strictly incoherent and satisfy $K_1^\dagger K_1 + K_2^\dagger K_2 = I$. In addition,

$$K_1|\psi(z)\rangle = \sqrt{p}|\psi(x)\rangle, \quad K_2|\psi(z)\rangle = \sqrt{1-p}|\psi(y)\rangle.$$

Since C is a coherence monotone by assumption, we deduce that

$$C(\psi(z)) \geq pC(\psi(x)) + (1-p)C(\psi(y)),$$

which implies that

$$f(px + (1-p)y) = f(z) \geq pf(x) + (1-p)f(y).$$

Therefore, f is both symmetric and concave. In addition, the coherence monotone C coincides with C_f when restricted to pure states.

Note that the above proof applies either IO or SIO is taken as the set of free operations. Therefore, the set of coherence monotones (measures) does not change under the interchange of IO and SIO. □

Coherent transformations under incoherent operations

Lemma S2 below was inspired by Refs. [28, 43]. It is a key ingredient for proving Theorem 2 and for establishing the majorization criterion on coherence transformations. Upon completion of this paper, we discovered that Lemma S2 follows from Theorem 1 in Ref. [44]. However, the proof there crucially depends on Theorem 1 in Ref. [28] by the same authors, which is a variant of Theorem 2 in our main text that we try to prove. To avoid circular argument and to make our presentation selfcontained, the discussion here is instrumental.

Lemma S2. Suppose $|\psi\rangle$ is an arbitrary pure state and $\Lambda = \{K_n\}$ is an arbitrary incoherent operation acting on $|\psi\rangle$. Let $p_n = \mathrm{tr}(K_n|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|K_n^\dagger)$ and $|\varphi_n\rangle = K_n|\psi\rangle/\sqrt{p_n}$ when $p_n > 0$. Then

$$\mu(\psi) \prec \sum_n p_n \mu^\downarrow(\varphi_n). \tag{S7}$$

Although $|\varphi_n\rangle$ is not well defined when $p_n = 0$, this does not cause any difficulty since $K_n|\psi\rangle$ is what really matters in our calculation and it vanishes when $p_n = 0$. Alternatively, we may restrict the summation in Eq. (S7) to the cases for which $p_n > 0$, and the conclusion is the same. Similar comments also apply to several other equations appearing in this paper and will not be mentioned again to avoid verbosity.

Proof. By assumption each Kraus operator K_n is incoherent and thus has at most one nonzero entry in each column. Therefore, K_n can be expressed in the form $K_n = P_n\tilde{K}_n$, where P_n is a permutation matrix and $\tilde{K}_n$ is upper triangular. The normalization condition $\sum_n K_n^\dagger K_n = \sum_n \tilde{K}_n^\dagger \tilde{K}_n = I$ implies that $\sum_{j,n} (\tilde{K}_n^*)_{jk}(\tilde{K}_n)_{jl} = \delta_{kl}$ for all k, l. Since $\tilde{K}_n$ are upper triangular, we deduce that

$$\sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{r} (\tilde{K}_n^*)_{jk}\tilde{K}_{n,jl} = \delta_{kl} \quad \forall r \geq \min\{k, l\}. \tag{S8}$$

Let $|\tilde{\varphi}_n\rangle = \tilde{K}_n|\psi\rangle/\sqrt{p_n}$, then $\sqrt{p_n}(\tilde{\varphi}_n)_j = \sum_j (\tilde{K}_n)_{jk}\psi_k$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{r}\sum_n p_n\mu_j(\tilde{\varphi}_n) = \sum_{j=0}^{r}\sum_n p_n|(\tilde{\varphi}_n)_j|^2 \\
&= \sum_{k,l}\sum_n\sum_{j=0}^{r} (\tilde{K}_n^*)_{jk}(\tilde{K}_n)_{jl}\psi_k^*\psi_l \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{r}|\psi_k|^2 + \sum_{k,l>r}\sum_n\sum_{j=0}^{r} (\tilde{K}_n^*)_{jk}(\tilde{K}_n)_{jl}\psi_k^*\psi_l \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{r}|\psi_k|^2 + \sum_n\sum_{j=0}^{r}\left|\sum_{l>r}(\tilde{K}_n)_{jl}\psi_l\right|^2 \\
&\geq \sum_{k=0}^{r}|\psi_k|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{r}\mu_k(\psi),
\end{aligned} \tag{S9}$$

where the third equality follows from Eq. (S8).

Since permutations of basis states are incoherent, without loss of generality, we may assume that the coefficients $|\psi_j|$ of ψ in the reference basis are in decreasing order. Then Eq. (S9) implies that

$$\mu(\psi) \prec \sum_n p_n\mu(\tilde{\varphi}_n) \prec \sum_n p_n\mu^\downarrow(\tilde{\varphi}_n) = \sum_n p_n\mu^\downarrow(\varphi_n),$$

where the last step follows from the equality $\varphi_n = P_n\tilde{\varphi}_n$ with P_n a permutation, that is, $\mu(\varphi_n) \simeq \mu(\tilde{\varphi}_n)$. □

As a side remark, Eq. (S9) in the proof of Lemma S2 actually holds for a larger class of operations whose Kraus operators have upper triangular form up to permutations on the left. Such operations may generate coherence, but Eq. (S7) still holds nevertheless if the coefficients $|\psi_j|$ of ψ in the reference basis are in decreasing order. However, in general this conclusion no longer holds if the coefficients do not have this property. Although this property can be recovered by a suitable permutation. The permutation required may destroy the upper triangular structure of the Kraus operators, which cannot be recovered by permutations only on the left, in contrast with the scenario of incoherent operations. That is why Lemma S2 cannot hold in general for this wider class of operations, as expected.

The majorization criterion on coherence transformations

In addition to proving Theorem 2, Lemma S2 enables us to construct a simple proof of the majorization crite-

rion on coherence transformations under incoherent operations [43]. This result is the analog of Nielsen's majorization criterion on entanglement transformations under LOCC [53].

Theorem S2. The pure state $|\psi\rangle$ can be transformed to $|\varphi\rangle$ under IO or SIO if and only if $\mu(\psi)$ is majorized by $\mu(\varphi)$.

The conclusion concerning IO was first presented in Ref. [43]; the original proof of the "only if" part has a gap, which was corrected upon completion of our work. In view of this gap, several recent works have derived weaker forms of Theorem S2 [26, 30]. In particular, the conclusion concerning SIO was established in Ref. [30].

Proof. Suppose $|\psi\rangle$ can be transformed to $|\varphi\rangle$ under an incoherent operation $\Lambda = \{K_n\}$. Let $|\varphi_n\rangle = K_n|\psi\rangle/\sqrt{p_n}$ with $p_n = \mathrm{tr}(K_n|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|K_n^\dagger)$. Then all $|\varphi_n\rangle$ with $p_n > 0$ are identical to $|\varphi\rangle$ up to phase factors. So $\mu(\psi) \prec \mu(\varphi)$ according to Lemma S2, that is, $\mu(\psi)$ is majorized by $\mu(\varphi)$. Obviously, the same reasoning applies if $\Lambda = \{K_n\}$ is strictly incoherent.

The proof of the other direction follows the approach presented in Ref. [43]. Since diagonal unitaries are incoherent, without loss of generality, we may assume that the coefficients ψ_j, φ_j of $|\psi\rangle$, $|\varphi\rangle$ in the reference basis are nonnegative.

If $\mu(\psi)$ is majorized by $\mu(\varphi)$, then $\mu(\psi) = A\mu(\varphi)$ with A a suitable doubly stochastic matrix [51–53]. Such a matrix can always be written as the product of a finite number of T-matrices, that is, $A = T_1T_2\cdots T_k$, where each T_j for $1 \le j \le k$ acts nontrivially only on two components, on which it takes on the form

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} a & 1-a \\ 1-a & a \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \le a \le 1.$$

By induction and the assumption that permutations are free, we may assume that A is a T-matrix of the form $A = \mathrm{diag}(T, I)$ for $0 < a < 1$, that is, $\mu(\psi) = \mathrm{diag}(T, I)\mu(\varphi)$. In addition, we may assume that the first two components φ_0, φ_1 of $|\varphi\rangle$ are not zero simultaneously since, otherwise, the action would be trivial. Let

$$K_1 = \sqrt{a}\,\mathrm{diag}\left(\frac{\varphi_0}{\psi_0}, \frac{\varphi_1}{\psi_1}, 1, \ldots, 1\right),$$

$$K_2 = \sqrt{1-a}\,\mathrm{diag}(K_2', 1, \ldots, 1),\ K_2' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\varphi_0}{\psi_1} \\ \frac{\varphi_1}{\psi_0} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the two operators K_1, K_2 are strictly incoherent and satisfy $K_1^\dagger K_1 + K_2^\dagger K_2 = I$. In addition,

$$K_1|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{a}|\varphi\rangle, \quad K_2|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{1-a}|\varphi\rangle.$$

So the operators K_1, K_2 define a strictly incoherent quantum operation that achieves the desired transformation from $|\psi\rangle$ to $|\varphi\rangle$. □

When deterministic transformations from $|\psi\rangle$ to $|\varphi\rangle$ fail, it is of interest to determine the maximal probability of such transformations. This problem has been solved in Ref. [28] recently. The result is reproduced below for the convenience of the reader.

Theorem S3. Let $P(\psi \to \varphi)$ be the maximal probability of transforming $|\psi\rangle$ to $|\varphi\rangle$ under IO. Then

$$P(\psi \to \varphi) = \min_{m \ge 0} \frac{\sum_{j \ge m} \mu_j^\downarrow(\psi)}{\sum_{j \ge m} \mu_j^\downarrow(\varphi)}. \tag{S10}$$

Theorem S3 still holds if IO is replaced by SIO. This is clear from the proof presented in Ref. [28] and Theorem S2, which imply that the operation achieving the maximal probability can be chosen to be strictly incoherent. It is worth pointing out that the sum $\sum_{j \ge m} \mu_j^\downarrow(\psi)$ for each positive integer m is a bona fide coherence measure associated with the function $f_m(p) = \sum_{j \ge m} p_j^\downarrow$, which is symmetric and concave [28, 54]. Theorem S3 is the analog of a similar result on entanglement transformations under LOCC, first established in Ref. [54]. The idea of the proof in Ref. [28] also mirrors the analog in the entanglement scenario. Not surprisingly, the majorization criterion plays a crucial role in proving Theorem S3 as it does in proving the result in Ref. [54]. Also the proof relies on Theorem 1 in Ref. [28], which is a variant of Theorem 2 in our main text. Since these stepping stones have been corroborated by now, Theorem S3 is also well established.